University of Massachusetts Amherst University Libraries

COLLECTION ANALYSIS & ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

Prepared by the Collection Analysis Task Force:

Jessica Adamick
Naka Ishii
Sally Krash
Rachel Lewellen
Steve McGinty
Scott Stangroom

Endorsed by SMG 3/22/2017

Contents

Executive Summary

Responsible collection stewardship includes regular assessment of collection resources. This assessment should include, at a minimum, data from the following: academics & enrollment, acquisitions, circulation, interlibrary loan, and usage statistics. Collections-related data are currently collected in the UMass Amherst Libraries through various avenues and made available through Tableau software and other sources. However, there are no guidelines on how these data are used in decision making. This report will provide details of available data sources and make recommendations on how data can be used to inform collections decisions. The full Collection Analysis Task Force (CATF) Charge can be found in Appendix A.

This report, in addition to providing details on collection assessment, will also provide a detailed subscription review model, review selector allocation formulas which can be adapted to a data-driven decision model, determine potential collection policy changes, and propose an update to the Libraries' Privacy Policy.

Recommendations

A. Expand the use of Tableau for data informed collections assessment activities to enable ease of use by selectors and other Library staff. Develop content focused dashboards for selectors that include: purchasing, overlap, circulation, ILL, reserves, MINES, COUNTER, and LibQUAL data. Work with selectors to ensure that Tableau views meet their assessment and analysis needs.
B. Hire a Data Analysis Librarian for the Discovery & Resource Management Systems (DRMS) unit to be responsible for extracting raw data from resource management systems, importing data into Tableau (or other visualization software), evaluating the integrity of the data, conducting data clean-up projects, and supporting data-informed collection assessment activities. This position would be the main point of contact for automating the gathering of vendor-supplied resource usage data. The focus of this position will be on collections data.
C. Hire a Data Analyst in the Assessment Unit to support data capture and use across the library. The Data Analyst would be responsible for capturing data from multiple sources across the Library and supporting use of data through various tools including Tableau. The focus of this position is library-wide, supporting assessment occurring in all library departments and reporting to the Assessment Librarian.
D. Provide regular training and information sessions about what data is available and how to use and access the data.
E. Use circulation data in combination with e-reserves, interlibrary loan and open-education resource data to determine which subject areas (call number ranges) are most frequently used. These could potentially inform the relevant selector(s) about the areas of more active student and faculty inquiry.
F. Use acquisitions purchasing data in combination with cataloging data and 5 Colleges overlap analysis to see which subject areas are being added to the collections both in our library and in other 5 Colleges libraries to assess how often newly acquired materials are being used. This data can be used to adjust spending to target areas that need more

focus than others as well as areas that show changes in usage, allowing collections funds to be spent in a more mindful way.

G. Use LibQUAL, MINES, collection use, and demographic data to develop a deeper understanding of the users and non-users of library collections. This includes relevant analysis of user status, affiliation, purpose of use and format/type of resource.
H. Look at subject areas for content being added to ScholarWorks and tie Open Access initiatives and e-reserves data into collection assessment activities.
I. E-resource usage data is available from varied sources: vendor usage statistics, proxy server data, and MINES data. Use this information for subscription review and to identify areas of overlap and areas that are underrepresented in the collection. Establish regular e-resource reviews (every 3-5 years as able/needed) and engage key stakeholders across campus on a regular basis in e-resource reviews. See Appendix D.
J. Use all of the above data points to inform selector allocation fund spending.
K. Library Acquisitions should build systematic alerts for journal package renewals to make sure they provide notice far enough in advance to start the review process.
L. Develop a subscription review checklist, similar to that in Appendix C.
M. Test the CATF-developed model for assessment of large-scale subscription review projects on two bundled packages that expire Dec. 31, 2017: ScienceDirect and Springer.
N. Retire formula method of budget allocation for subject specialist monograph allocations and instead implement a data-driven firm-order monograph fund to more equitably make funds available for discretionary spending.
O. Implement a tri-annual database review process in order to free up funding for new subscription resources.

1. Data-Driven Collection Assessment

In order to determine how to best use data to inform collections decisions, it was first necessary to assess what data sources are currently available. This was done by conducting a data inventory. Additionally, the CATF conducted a review of best-practices in other large academic libraries in conjunction with a literature review. The next step was to survey selectors about what data sources they use or would use if available. After a careful analysis of these combined sources, the CATF developed a set of recommendations for selectors and collection management staff to use in assessing Library collections.

Data-Driven Collection Assessment Recommendations

Some data that we collect are visualized through Tableau, but not all. **Recommendation A**: The CATF recommends finding ways to pull more data into Tableau for ease of use by selectors and other Library staff for collection analysis purposes. **Recommendation B**: To this end, the CATF recommends that a Data Analysis Librarian be added to the Discovery & Resource Management Systems (DRMS) unit to be responsible for extracting raw data from resource management systems, importing data into Tableau (or other visualization software), evaluating the integrity of the data, conducting data clean-up projects, and supporting data-driven collection assessment activities. This position would be the main point of contact for systematizing the gathering of vendor-supplied data. **Recommendation C:** Additionally, the CATF recommends that a Data Analyst be added to the Assessment unit in order to support collection of data from multiple sources across the Library, develop and maintain a data warehouse for various types of assessment data, and support use of data through various tools including Tableau.

Making collections data available in a data visualization tool like Tableau would provide selectors with a common single location to go to look at collections data. **Recommendation A**: As well, selectors should provide feedback to assist with developing Tableau views that will work for them. They also recognize the need for training; this implies some recognition of the desire to use available data sets. **Recommendation D**: The CATF recommends regular training and information sessions, starting with a meeting with selectors to present survey results and discuss why and how selectors might better use collection data. Training would fall under the purview of the new Data Analysis Librarian, in conjunction with other relevant Library staff.

CATF members recommend the following data sets be used to inform collections decisions as follows: (**Recommendations**)

E. Use circulation data in combination with e-reserves and interlibrary loan data to determine which subject areas (call number ranges) are most frequently used. These could potentially inform the relevant selector(s) about the areas of more active student and faculty inquiry.
F. Use expenditure data in combination with cataloging and 5 Colleges overlap analysis to see which subject areas are being added to the collections both in our library and in other 5 Colleges libraries to assess how often newly acquired materials are being used. This data can be used to adjust spending to target areas that need more focus than others as well as areas that show changes in usage, allowing collections funds to be spent in a more mindful way.
G. Use LibQUAL, MINES, collection use, and demographic data to develop a deeper understanding of the users and non-users of library collections. This includes relevant analysis of user status, affiliation, purpose of use and format/type of resource.
H. Look at subject areas for content being added to ScholarWorks and tie Open Access initiatives and e-reserves data into collection assessment activities.
I. E-resource usage data is available from varied sources: vendor usage statistics, ScholarWorks, Google Analytics, proxy server data, and MINES data. Use this information for subscription review and to identify areas of overlap and areas that are underrepresented in the collection. Establish regular e-resource reviews (every 3-5 years as able/needed) and engage key stakeholders across campus on a regular basis in e-resource reviews.
J. Use all of the above data points to inform selector allocation fund spending.

There may be factors to consider beyond data for decisions about our collections; e.g., accreditation for some programs, additions of new programs and courses, and discontinuation of programs and courses. Also we recognize that collection assessment activities need to be conducted on a routine basis above and beyond the subscription review mentioned above.

2. Data-Driven Subscription Review Process

In today's environment of rapidly escalating subscription costs and ongoing library budget reductions, it is prudent to systematically review subscription content as good stewards of both our financial and scholarly resources. As good stewards of the financial resources that the University provides to the Library for collection acquisitions and management, we are responsible for negotiating the most favorable licensing terms, participating in collaborative collections initiatives, and looking for non-traditional ways to mitigate the rising costs of scholarly resources. In particular, bundled packages from major publishers are taking up more and more of the collections budget and locking our library and others into multi-year deals with set annual increases and set title lists. Licensing does not allow for costs or title reductions. During a budget reduction year, libraries have had to cut subscription resources that are not part of a package or multi-year deal to adhere to reduced budgets, excluding the possibility of de-selecting titles from those packages/licenses that are no longer needed in favor of cancelling titles that are needed but not part of a package/license and therefore are prime targets for budget reductions. In some ways, this contradicts our role as good stewards of scholarly resources when collection decisions are limited by publisher license agreements. In essence, we have gradually turned over collection management to big publishers, a trend we should prioritize reversing.

The problem of escalating prices and bundled packages came to a head in 2011 when Research Libraries UK refused to renew their "big deal" packages with Elsevier and Wiley. After heated negotiations, both entities came to an agreement for a five year license agreement – *Plan B: Life After the Big Deal*- http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2012/04/reference/plan-b-life-after-the-big-deal/. Also see *Affordable subscriptions for periodicals initiative (ASPI) -* http://www.rluk.ac.uk/strategicactivity/projects/aspi/. Fast forward to 2016, and UK libraries are once again negotiating their big deal package with Elsevier, which expires at the end of 2016 – *UK national negotiations with Elsevier: it seems we're not messing around* - https://svpow.com/2016/06/07/uk-national-negotiations-with-elsevier-it-seems-were-not-messing-around/.

Several Canadian university libraries (University of Toronto, University of Guelph, and the University of Montreal) have recently gone through subscription assessments and gave a presentation on their experiences – *Is the Big Deal a Good Deal? Methods and Approaches to Evaluating Bundled Content* - http://www.ala.org/alctsnews/features/ac2016-program-bigdeal. Although they used different approaches to reviewing subscription resources, the bottom line was that they were able to use the results of their assessment efforts to re-negotiate existing license agreements and to start a broader conversation on how to assess and re-negotiate the Big Deal.

Subscription Review Process Recommendation

On July 13, 2016, SMG endorsed a proposal to replicate the University of Montreal Periodical Review methodology in the UMass Amherst Libraries. The task of developing this model fit into the work of the Collection Analysis Task Force, and is therefore included in this report.

Recommendation K: The first recommendation regarding this type of model is for Library Acquisitions to build in systematic alerts for journal package renewals to make sure they provide notice far enough in advance to start the review process. Acquisitions already has alerts setup through the CORAL system; and the recommendation is to review these alerts to make sure they are timely for the Big Deal packages. **Recommendation L**: Also, CATF recommends that a Serials Review Checklist, similar to the one that Western University Libraries uses, be developed. (See Appendix C)

The CATF developed a model for assessment of large-scale subscription review projects that support data-driven decision making, see Appendix D. **Recommendation M**: The CATF further recommends that this process be tested on two bundled packages that expire Dec. 31, 2017: ScienceDirect and Springer. The ScienceDirect license is a UMass system license, so stakeholders from across the 5 campuses would need to be involved. The Springer license is specifically for UMass Amherst and that review process would need to take place on our campus. In each case, review processes would need to start in time to provide each vendor with advance notice of changes to our license agreements, as detailed in each agreement.

3. Data-Driven Selector Allocation Formula

For well over a decade, the Libraries have employed a mixed approach to allocating funds to the Acquisitions budget. The vast percentage of the acquisitions budget (nearly 85-90%) has been allocated based on historic spending. Much of the Libraries budget is already spoken for by continuations (85% in FY17), and by other collections fees such as: binding, digitization fees, membership and service fees, ILL and document delivery fees, physical processing fees and MARC records fees. We base current allocations on what we spent over the previous three years, and where applicable, we factor in an increase for inflation.

The Libraries monographs allocation, which in FY17 was 11% of the overall Acquisitions budget, is split among approvals, standing orders, E-book DDA (i.e., JSTOR), and firm order monographs selection. The approvals portion of the monographs budget is allocated according to historic spending and includes an inflationary factor to cover anticipated cost increases. The 5 Colleges is currently reviewing a plan to develop a 5 Colleges shared approval plan that will largely replace our main university press approval plan, thereby freeing up funds for more discretionary spending on monographs.

Firm order monographs (print and electronic) money is partially allocated based on historic spending and partially based on a formula that considers enrollment and other factors. This area of the budget includes Books on Demand, Reserves, standing orders, and finally subject selector funds. Books on Demand, standing orders, and Reserves funding have to-date relied on historic spending. Subject selector funding, which has been the most malleable area of the budget because of ever increasing costs for resources we’ve otherwise committed to elsewhere in the budget is allocated based on a formula. The idea behind using a formula is to impart a certain sense of equity and fairness into the allocation process. But even with a formula, equity and fairness is not always apparent.

The formula the Libraries use for Subject Selector allocations is based on the population of undergraduate and graduate student majors and non-majors and on numbers of FTE faculty in subject disciplines as reflected in documents published by the UMass Amherst Office of Institutional Research. Student and faculty demographics are supposed to represent demand for resources. That is, the higher the number of students and faculty in a given discipline, the higher the demand for resources, and thus the higher the amount of the budget allocation for that discipline. The reality we confront using this method of allocation is that “lab, case-study and research-heavy” disciplines on campus have student and faculty populations far larger than the “book-heavy” disciplines on campus. The money for monographs therefore largely goes to the non-book-heavy disciplines.

There are a variety of factors that could be included in an Acquisitions budget formula, such as circulation statistics, average cost of books in a subject area, and so forth, which could help in adjusting for the realities of student and faculty populations’ actual use of (and demand for) monographs, but the Libraries have tried to keep the formula simple. While relatively simple in concept, our formula method of allocation still requires a great amount of time and labor to initiate and manage each fiscal year, and the results are less than perfect. Subject specialists in book-heavy disciplines want for more each fiscal year, while lab, case-study and research-heavy subject specialists are hard-pressed to spend their allocations. In many of those disciplines, more funding is needed for continuing resources, and there is no established method for adding new subscription resources without dropping existing resources.

Acquisitions could improve the formula used to account for variables such as collection use/circulation or other factors, and we can leave that door of possibility open for the future. We would like, however, to simplify things further and hopefully build in some flexibility in how we allocate and spend the firm order monographs budget allocation.

Selector Allocation Formula Recommendations

Recommendation N: For all of the reasons listed above, the CATF proposes that the Libraries abandon the currently used formula method of budget allocation for discretionary monographs selection in favor of a method that supports an alternative data-driven process. We propose that the Libraries allocate one pool of money for discretionary monographs spending. Every librarian with collection responsibilities will get an equal percentage of that allocation at the beginning of the initial fiscal year of implementation. During the year, collections usage data, and ILL and faculty/student demand data will be consulted and compared with the previous three years of data to see which subject areas are more heavily used or in demand. Adjustments to allocations will be made based on that data. Throughout each fiscal year librarians will be informed when certain milestones of spending approach. When a librarian’s allocation is spent, any order requests from that point forward in the then current fiscal year will be held. If there is one-time end-of-year money available, held orders may selectively be placed, otherwise they will continue to be held until the next fiscal year.

Recommendation O: A second recommendation addresses the need for regular pools of funding for new continuation resources. The CATF recommends regular database subscription reviews, every three years or as needed. The review process would identify low-use databases and databases that have content that overlaps with other subscription databases. A list of cancellations would be generated, and the amount of savings would be put towards a pool of money for new subscription resources. Naturally, this can only occur in years when we have a budget increase. This would not be feasible in years where the collections budget is reduced.

4. Data Inventory

An inventory was conducted of data collected by the Libraries. Parameters included: which library department collects the data: who produces the data; which staff members are responsible for gathering and managing data, including the frequency of updates; where the data reside; what formats are available; and whether collection is manual or automatic. Table 1 provides an overview of data sources and data collected.

Some data sources are visualized using Tableau, but not all. One of the recommendations of the CATF is to find ways to pull more data into Tableau for ease of use by selectors and other Library staff for collection analysis purposes. To this end, the CATF recommends that a Data Analysis Librarian be added to the Discovery & Resource Management Systems (DRMS) unit to be responsible for extracting raw data from resource management systems, importing data into Tableau (or other visualization software), evaluating the integrity of the data, conducting data clean-up projects, and supporting data-driven collection assessment activities. This position would be the main point of contact for automating the gathering of vendor-supplied data.

Data Source	**Type**
ALEPH	Circulation, purchasing, Five College, duplication data, in-house use, cataloging statistics
CORAL	License terms, acquisitions data, title date, coverage
ARES	E-reserves use
ILLiad	Article requests, book/video requests, copyright fees, general summary data
LibQUAL	User feedback
MINES	E-resource use
Proxy server	E-resource use
ScholarWorks	UMass research and teaching materials in multiple formats
SFX	E-resource use, title data, coverage
Vendor supplied	Consortia project data. COUNTER e-resource usage statistics, non-COUNTER compliant statistics

5. Practices that Inform Recommendations (Environmental Scan)

The University of Massachusetts Office of Institutional Research considers the following institutions our peers: Indiana University – Bloomington, Iowa State University, Rutgers – The State University of New Jersey, Stony Brook University, University of California – Santa Barbara, University of Colorado – Boulder, University of Connecticut, University of Delaware, University of Maryland – College Park, and the University of Oregon. These university libraries were queried as to what kind of collection assessment activities they engage in, and most have no formal policy and stated there were little data-driven collection assessment activities. However, the University of Connecticut and Stony Brook University provided a wealth of information on e-resource assessment.

University of Connecticut

The University of Connecticut has conducted in-depth assessment of both database and e-journal packages. Data was used to determine which resources could be cancelled in order to meet reduced budget requirements, and on-going assessment of e-resources has been established. The University of Connecticut has decided to take a longer term look at their practices. Rather than use data to allocate materials budgets year after year, they want to establish a long-term collection review process. This process will inform decisions about collections and formats that go beyond a twelve-month window.

Stony Brook University

Stony Brook University is emphasizing long-term goals. They are doing this for two reasons; first, they want to demonstrate a strong return on investment to university administration as the data accumulates over the years. Data from one or two years may contain anomalies that could skew any analysis. Secondly, they want to do internal planning with the library to take a broader look at what the data are saying. Decisions about things like off-site storage, e-book purchasing, library space planning and serials preservation/access can all be better informed by this kind of approach.

Northwestern University

While not considered a peer institution, Northwestern University Libraries provided (until recently) a wealth of information on their assessment activities. Content can be accessed through the Wayback Machine at https://web.archive.org/web/20160316165007/http://www.library.northwestern.edu/about/library-administration/departments-offices/e-resources-collection-analysis/collection-analysis. Very specifically, some of their DataBank information might be useful for our purposes, available at http://libguides.northwestern.edu/CollectionBuilding.

- Step 1 Analyze: They look at the following data that we also gather: ILL, circulation and user statistics for e-resources (we have this through MINES).

- Step 2 Get Input: They survey faculty and students, and we already have existing survey data that we can use. We would likely not use the word analysis that they use, but will consult with selectors, faculty and students.
- Step 3 Create Lists: They generate lists from ILL reports, from a comparison of other libraries, and from other resources, like the Amazon best-seller lists. We already have some data feeding into Tableau and that can be tweaked to our needs. As well, we do currently have overlap analysis of the 5 Colleges print monographs.
- Step 4 Strategize: This piece really does not map well to our efforts, as it address budgetary variables that a well-funded private research library would have that we do not.

University of Montreal

In the past three years, the University of Montreal has undergone assessment activities related to the review and cancellation of some of their bundled journal packages. They looked at use and cost and surveyed key stakeholders across campus, including faculty, to determine which journals were the most important to them. The final result of this in-depth assessment process provided detailed information that was used in negotiating more favorable terms for subscription package licensing.

In all cases, short-term and long-term goals need to be clarified. Echoing the Stony Brook interview, beyond providing information to selectors for the next year's decisions, they see a longer-term collection review process as data accumulates over the years. They are also looking to demonstrate value for return on investment to university leadership. In a similar vein, The University of Montreal Library Working Group recommends data collection with faculty and graduate students every four years. In this way the library can "precisely gage the gap between the current journals collection and the real needs of the community, so it can bridge that gap as soon as financial conditions permit."

6. Selector Survey

The CATF surveyed Library selectors with direct fiduciary responsibility about their use of the following data sources in conducting collection assessment activities.

- ALEPH circulation
- Book re-shelving (in-house use)
- Interlibrary Loan (books or journals borrowed)
- Journal usage statistics
- Database usage statistics
- Streaming resources usage statistics
- E-Book usage statistics
- E-Reserves
- Electronic Resources Use Survey (MINES)

Survey questions and responses can be found in Appendix B. Survey results indicate that selectors do employ some of these data, but use is sporadic rather than systematic. This could be because there is no one simple place that houses all available data.

7. Collections Policy Update

No existing Libraries collections policies are impacted by our recommendations, including the UMA Libraries' Collection Development Policy and our print retention agreement with the Eastern Academic Scholars' Trust (EAST).

8. Privacy Policy Update

The Task Force along with the Assessment Committee prepared an updated statement about the use and privacy of library data. This acknowledges the proliferation of data generated in contemporary society, reflects the mandate to use data on behalf of users and reaffirms our commitment of protecting privacy. It was approved by SMG on October 26, 2016.

Responsible Use and Privacy of Library Data Statement

The UMass Amherst Libraries collect data about your library use in order to improve services and resources, and to integrate with broader University initiatives. No person or entity may access protected data, except through strict processes established by University policy and in compliance with Massachusetts and federal laws. We value your academic and intellectual freedom, and we are committed to protecting the privacy and confidentiality of all user data. We accept the responsibility to ethically use data to improve student learning and to contribute to the goals of the University, the Campus, and the Libraries.

Third Party Vendors

The Libraries license services and content from third party vendors who have their own privacy policies and confidentiality practices. When you leave the Libraries' website, your interaction with these systems will be governed by their individual privacy policies. Check the privacy statements for specific vendors to learn how your data is stored and used by them.

Google Analytics

The UMass Amherst Libraries and the Five College Catalog use Google Analytics, a web analytics service that operates through the use of a cookie, which is a text file placed on your computer containing information about your use of the Libraries' website. The information stored in the cookie (including your IP address) is transmitted to and stored by Google. This information is used for analytical and feature-improvement related purposes only. More information about Google Analytics and Google's privacy policy is available here. You can opt-out of Google Analytics tracking though the Google Analytics opt-out browser add-on: https://tools.google.com/dlpage/gaoptout

Questions may be directed to the Dean of Libraries, DOL@library.umass.edu, (413) 545-6868.

Approved by Senior Management Group, October 26, 2016

9. Next Steps

The CATF identified several areas where data-driven support for assessment activities is feasible. It is necessary to establish guidelines and make recommendations for how to move forward with collections analysis and assessment activities. The recommendations listed in the Executive Summary should be implemented as soon as feasible.

Hire a Data Analysis Librarian. This position will replace a recent retirement in IRM and focus specifically on collections data and IRM projects. The Data Analysis Librarian will work with the Assessment Librarian to assume the ongoing management and implementation of recommendations A-J.

Determine feasibility of adding a Data Analyst to work directly with the Assessment Librarian to support library-wide (beyond just collections) data collection and use.

Scholarly Communications, Reserves staff, and the Data Analysis Librarian will collaborate on recommendation H. - Look at subject areas for content being added to ScholarWorks and tie Open Access initiatives, Global Education initiatives and e-reserves data into collection assessment activities.

Acquisitions staff will manage recommendations K-O.

References

Arlitsch, K, & Rossmann, D 2015, 'From acquisitions to access: the changing nature of library budgeting', *Journal of Library Administration*, 5, p. 394.

Buser, R 2016, Is the Big Deal a Good Deal? Methods and Approaches to Evaluating Bundled Content. [blog] *ALCTS News.* Available at: http://www.ala.org/alctsnews/features/ac2016-program-bigdeal [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Canepi, K 2007, 'Fund allocation formula analysis: Determining elements for best practices in libraries', *Library Collections, Acquisitions And Technical Services*, 31, pp. 12-24.

Crawford, G, German, L 2014, *Creating a New Collections Allocation Model for These Changing Times: Challenges, Opportunities, and Data*. [online] Available at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston/2013/Collection/9/ [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Fleming, R n.d., 'Looking at the Library Collections Budget: Budget as Story and Interrogating Narrative Frames', *Serials Review*, 41, 3, pp. 173-175.

FuLong Wu, E, & Shelfer, K 2007, 'Materials budget allocation: A formula fitness review', *Library Collections, Acquisitions And Technical Services*, 31, pp. 171-183.

Gardner, J, Hunt, Stuart 2016. UK National Negotiations with Elsevier: It Seems We're Not Messing Around. [blog] *Sauropod Vertebra Picture of the Week.* Available at: https://svpow.com/2016/06/07/uk-national-negotiations-with-elsevier-it-seems-were-not-messing-around/ [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Harker, K. and Klein, J. 2016, *ARL Spec Kit 352: Collection assessment*. 1st ed. ARL.

Lyons, L, & Blosser, J 2012, 'An Analysis and Allocation System for Library Collections Budgets: The Comprehensive Allocation Process (CAP)', *The Journal Of Academic Librarianship*, 38, pp. 294-310.

Moll, M, Patrick, A, & Coreejes-Brink, A 2014, 'Adjusting book budget divisions to improve advocacy A case study of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT)', *Library Management*, 35, 6/7, pp. 521-526.

RLUK.ac.uk. 2017, *Affordable subscriptions for periodicals initiative (ASPI) - Research Libraries UK*. [online] Available at: http://www.rluk.ac.uk/strategicactivity/projects/aspi/ [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Simpson, G 2012, The Cost of Subscribing to Academic Journals. [blog] *From the Bottom of the Heap.* Available at: http://www.fromthebottomoftheheap.net/2012/03/04/the-cost-of-subscribing-to-academic-journals/ [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Verma, H 2012, Plan B: Life After the Big Deal. [blog] *Library Journal Reviews*. Available at: http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2012/04/reference/plan-b-life-after-the-big-deal/ [Accessed 12 Jan. 2017].

Walters, W n.d., 'A regression-based approach to library fund allocation', *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 51, 4, pp. 263-278.

..

Appendix A: Collection Analysis Task Force (CATF) Charge

Background: Responsible collection stewardship includes regular assessment of collection resources. This assessment should include, at a minimum, data from the following: academics & enrollment, acquisitions, circulation, interlibrary loan, and usage statistics. Collections-related data are currently collected in the UMass Amherst Libraries through various avenues and made available through Tableau software and other sources. However, there are no guidelines on how these data are used in decision making.

Charge: This Task Force will study how and what collections data are currently being collected and used in our library; review the literature and talk to peers about best practices; and recommend guidelines for using collections and other data in making collections decisions.

Tasks:
- Conduct an inventory of current data that is being collected and disseminated in the UMass Amherst Libraries; assess the forms of the data and how they might be used in conjunction with each other
- Conduct a literature review and environmental scan of peer institutions for existing practices for collecting, disseminating, and using collections and other related data to inform decision-making
- Explore and assess options for using data to inform our decision-making processes; determine what we need to include that we are not currently collecting, and what we need to make data more useful.
- Review existing UMass Amherst Libraries policies and guidelines for their impact on any recommendations developed by the Task Force.
- Present a report including recommended guidelines to the Dean of Libraries and SMG by 12/31/2016.

Membership: Appointed by the Director of Libraries
- Assistant to the Associate Director for Library Services
- Head of Information Resources Management
- Acquisitions Unit Coordinator
- Assessment Librarian
- Social Sciences Research Services Librarian
- Science Librarian

Chair: Head of Information Resources Management

Meetings: As needed, at the call of the Chair. Because of the nature of the task force work, meetings are closed. Other staff may be consulted when their specialized feedback or knowledge is needed.

Information Sharing: Post agendas and brief minutes of each meeting and publish them on LibWire. Provide additional information to the Dean of Libraries as requested.

UMass Amherst Libraries: Approved by SMG on March 16, 2016

Appendix B: Selector Survey Results

Survey questions and summary of responses:

1. **Which kinds of data/statistics have you used in selection decisions?**
    - ILL usage
    - Database usage
    - Aleph circulation
    - E-journal usage
2. **Which sources of data would you like training in?**
    - E-reserves training
    - Streaming media data
    - E-book
    - MINES data
    - ILL
    - Database usage
    - E-journal usage
3. **What would be the most useful way to present data to you?**
    - Tableau (or other data visualization) was the most popular option
    - Spreadsheets were also mentioned
4. **Is there information missing about library collections that you would make use of?**
    - *I'd like to capture user info on book circulation, i.e. how many junior psychology majors check out books?*
    - *Most everything I need is found on Coral / that said, Coral only goes back so far so it would be nice to see some historical data for some resources decisions*
5. **Any other comments for us?**
    - *In general, we should be willing to walk away from deals that are not best for our users (poor platform) or when we are not given usage data that are counter compliant*

Appendix C: Subscription Review Checklist

Western University Libraries Serials Review Checklist (pg. 154 of ARL spec kit 352)

REQUIRED INFORMATION	
Name:	Springer E-books
Description:	Available through SpringerLink's IP-enabled eBook gateway libraries and corporations can offer their patrons online access to the most worthwhile books instantly from multiple locations, including library, office, home or wherever they are. Springer's eBook Collection uses the portability, searchability, and unparalleled ease of access of PDF and HTML data formats to make access for researchers, as convenient as possible. Springer eBook Collections offer accurate reproductions of high quality Springer print book publications, together with all the added benefits of an online environment, including exceptional search capabilities and bookmarks. The collection is available on the Springerlink and Scholars Portal interfaces with no DRM and perpetual ownership.
Price (original currency, CDN conversion):	$[redacted] CAD in 2015 $[redacted] (USD) quote in 2016
Library Responsibility (e.g. Centrally funded, Weldon, etc)	Centrally funded
In what format is the resource? Is this the best format?	Online
REQUIRED CRITERIA **Additional Details:**	
Usage data from all sources, eg. Scholars portal, publishers website, aggregator websites	610,175 chapter downloads* (2015) *For whole book downloads, Springer adds the total number of chapters to the overall usage count (e.g. if a book has 50 chapters and the book is downloaded, our usage will show 50 chapter downloads even if the user only accessed one chapter)
Price	$[redacted]
Cost per use Cost per use (3 year average)	$[redacted]
Percentage of package use	[redacted]%
Overlapping content/title overlap	N/A
Comparable content – similar subject coverage (databases)	N/A
User groups [e.g. multi-disciplinary areas] , status	Multi-disciplinary but with emphasis on STEM/specific subjects: Medicine BioMed Engineering Computer Science Math
Content: ☐ Full Text ☐ Abstracting ☐ Indexing ☒ Other	Full text e-books

Platform/Interface	SpringerLink and Scholars Portal (local load)
SFX Compliant: ☒ Yes ☐ No	
OTHER CRITERIA **Additional Details:**	
Will we have post-cancellation access?	Yes. All previously purchased e-books will be available on the SpringerLink and Scholars Portal platforms
Impact factor and ranking position	N/A
Where is it indexed?	N/A
Who has requested it?	N/A
Other information / description	Lecture notes in Computer Science is considered a key resource for the Computer Science program, and Springer is making this series accessible exclusively through package deals. The Engineering Librarian has identified Springer titles as core resources to the discipline.
Strategic research areas	Medicine BioMed Engineering Computer Science Math
# Faculty publications in the journal	N/A
Reliability of platform	Strong
# of graduate students enrolled in program	Computer Science, 118 Engineering, 698
Which undergraduate and/or professional programs does the resource support?	N/A
Embargo Period? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Explain nature/length of embargo period	No
Pricing Model: ☐ Annual Subscription ☒ One time purchase ☐ One time purchase + Annual Fee for ongoing access ☐ Other	The Springer E-book OCUL deal provides subscribing libraries ownership in perpetuity of most Springer e-books and e-book series published within the subscribing year (with the exception of certain imprints and series).
Other: Email communications:	

Appendix D: UMass Subscription Review Process

This model is to be used for large-scale subscription package reviews. Portions of this model may be extracted to develop more succinct models for smaller-scale reviews.

- Determine package to review. (Library Collections Administration)
    - License review:
        - What is included in the package?
        - When does the license expire?
        - How much notification does the publisher/vendor require for changes to the license and/or licensed material?
    - Budget Review:
        - What is the budget?
        - How does this package fit into the overall collections budget?
        - How much of the budget can be allocated for this renewal?
        - Can we enter into a multi-year agreement?
        - How much of an increase can we sustain over the life of a new multi-year agreement?
        - Do we need to negotiate a decrease?
        - If a decrease cannot be negotiated, what is our plan B?
    - Communicate license and budget review needs to Dean of Libraries and to establish groups and committees.
        - Include budget information to inform goal setting for Steering Committee.
    - Form Groups:
        - Form Steering Committee
            - This will be library and campus leadership who are determined to be key stakeholders for the package under review.
        - Form Data Working Group
            - This group will focus on data collection and analysis.
        - Form Acquisitions Group
            - This group will include staff knowledgeable about license terms and electronic resource workflows.
- Develop a communication plan. (Steering Committee)
    - Determine all stakeholders who need to be involved and create a plan for buy-in.
        - Involve Library Development & Communications as needed.
    - Develop a plan to meet with schools/colleges/departments.
    - Develop a plan to get Faculty Senate Committee input (Research Council, Research Library Council, and Graduate Council).
    - Determine survey requirements.
        - Develop survey.
            - Establish a target number of priority titles for teaching and research.
                - Up to 10?

            - Establish a target number of essential titles for discipline.
                - Up to 5?
- Set goals and establish timelines. (Steering Committee)
    - Financial goal.
        - Establish a goal after reviewing initial budget review information.
    - Data analysis goals. Input will be required from Data Working Group.
        - COUNTER statistics (downloads) JR1
            - Determine a minimum acceptable annual download rate.
                - Low use: below 9
                - Moderate use: 10-99
                - High use: 100-999
                - Heavy use: 1000+
        - Citation analysis. (Do we need to analyze both types listed below?)
            - Determine which journals are being cited by UMass authors
            - Determine where UMass authors are publishing
        - Teaching and research needs.
            - Minimums determined when developing survey.
    - Determine how much time is needed for:
        - Communication plan.
        - Surveys.
        - Data analysis.
        - Publisher notification.
        - Cancellation process (if needed).
    - Develop a timeline.
- Gather data. (Data Working Group)
    - Distribute survey to key stakeholders as determined by review group.
    - Gather COUNTER JR1 statistics for 3 previous calendar years.
    - Conduct citation analysis to determine highly cited journals.
    - Create local database of data & compile data into Tableau view for analysis.
- Data analysis: (Data Working Group)
    - Determine essential, teaching and research title lists from survey results.
    - Determine usage patterns through COUNTER analysis.
    - Determine highly cited journals from citation analysis.
    - Combine results to develop a list of most needed journals.
        - Determine costs if package is broken apart.
        - Determine if most needed journals list needs to be adjusted to meet financial goals.
        - Provide as many options as possible.
        - Send results to Review Group.
- Results: (Steering Committee)
    - Review results of data analysis.
    - Make recommendations on how to proceed with the package renewal.
- Complete process: (Acquisitions Group)
    - Communicate intentions to vendors.
    - Review, adjust and implement cancellation workflows as needed.